

REMARKS

The following remarks are prepared in response to the Office Action mailed June 7, 2004. Claims 1-47 are pending in this application, after entry of this amendment.

Claim 33 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 23. Claims 1, 3, 5-9, 11-22, 24, 26-29, 31-32, 34 and 37-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Wesinger, Jr. et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,788 hereinafter *Wesinger*). Claims 2, 4, 10, 23, 25, 30, 33 and 35-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wesinger* in view of *Williams* (U.S. Patent No. 6,304,973 hereinafter *Williams*). Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reexamination.

Objection Under 37 C.F.R. §1.75

Applicant has amended claim 33 to differ from claim 23. Accordingly, the objection to claim 33 should be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§102(e) and 103(a)

Independent Claims 1 and 34

The rejection of claims 1 and 34 should be withdrawn as *Wesinger* fails to disclose all the recitations of claims 1 and 34 and therefore does not anticipate claims 1 and 34.

Focusing on the specific recitations of claims 1 and 34 and the inadequacies of *Wesinger*, claims 1 and 34 recite: A secure network where “all of the network devices corresponding to at least one of the plurality of network bubbles have the same network security policy.”

Wesinger discloses a first site 101 having a first accounting network 103 and a first corporate network 109 and a second site 151 having a second accounting network 153 and a second corporate network 159 (*Wesinger*, col. 6, lns. 41-46 and figure 1). On page 3 of the office action, the Examiner identified the plurality of network bubbles to be the first site 101 and

the second site 151 (see also figure 1). Furthermore, on page 3 of the office action, the Examiner identified the plurality of bubble partitions (of the first network bubble) to be the first accounting network 103 and the first corporate network 109 and each bubble partition as having at least one network device C (see also figure 1). Additionally, *Wesinger* discloses the following: “Precautions are required to safeguard sensitive accounting data such that it cannot be accessed over the general corporate network. A first firewall (105, 155) is used for this purpose. The first firewall is interposed between the accounting network and the general corporate network.” (*Wesinger*, col. 6, lns. 46-51, emphasis added).

Wesinger emphasis the need to have different network security policies within a network bubble (e.g., 101) so that sensitive data in the accounting network 103 cannot be accessed from the corporate network 109. This requires the network devices (e.g., element C) that are part of the first accounting network 103 to have a stricter (i.e., a different) network security policy than the network devices that are part of the first corporate network 109 (see figure 1). Otherwise, if all the network devices within the same network bubble had the same network security policy, *Wesinger* would not need a firewall between the accounting network 103 and the corporate network 109. Firewalls are employed to restrict access to the individual networks (*Wesinger*, col. 6, lns. 32-33). Hence, *Wesinger* actually teaches away from the invention defined by claims 1 and 34 by having a firewall between the accounting network 103 and the corporate network 109. Therefore, *Wesinger* fails to teach or suggest that “all of the network devices corresponding to at least one of the plurality of network bubbles have the same network security policy.” Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicant has reviewed *Williams* and has found no teaching or suggestion in *Williams* that would remedy the deficiencies of *Wesinger*. Accordingly, claims 1 and 34 are allowable over the combination of *Wesinger* and *Williams*.

Dependent Claims 2-16 and 35-47

Claims 2-16 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 35-47 depend from independent claim 34. All of these dependent claims define the secure network with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Wesinger* and *Williams*. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1 and 34, the rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 17

The rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn as *Wesinger* fails to disclose all the recitations of claim 17 and therefore does not anticipate claim 17.

Focusing on the specific recitations of claim 17 and the inadequacies of *Wesinger*, claim 17 recites: A secure network comprising “a plurality of network control points connecting the first network bubble to the second network bubble.”

Wesinger discloses a first site 101 and a second site 151 (*Wesinger*, col. 6, lns. 41-43 and figure 1). On page 3 of the office action, the Examiner identified a first network bubble to be the first site 101 and a second network bubble to be the second site 151 (see also figure 1). Figure 1 shows a single network control point connecting the first site 101 to the second site 151. Furthermore, *Wesinger* discloses the following: “The important point is that all traffic between the two networks must pass through a single, narrow point of controlled access. A firewall therefore brings a great deal of leverage to bear on the problem of network security, allowing security measures to be concentrated on this controlled access point.” (*Wesinger*, col. 6, lns. 17-

22, emphasis added). *Wesinger* emphasizes the need to have a single network control point when using two networks. By contrast, claim 17 recites a plurality of network control points connecting the first network bubble to the second network bubble (Emphasis added). Therefore, *Wesinger* fails to teach or suggest a secure network having a plurality of network control points connecting the first network bubble to the second network bubble. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, Applicant has reviewed *Williams* and has found no teaching or suggestion in *Williams* that would remedy the deficiencies of *Wesinger*. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over the combination of *Wesinger* and *Williams*.

Dependent Claims 18-33

Claims 18-33 depend from independent claim 17. All of these dependent claims define the secure network with greater particularity and thus further distinguish over *Wesinger* and *Williams*. For this reason, and for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 17, the rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

If there are any questions with regards to this prosecution, or if the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of the case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on October 7, 2004.

By: Rachel Carter




Signature

Dated: October 7, 2004

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.


Ketan S. Vakil
Registration No. 43,215
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, California 92614-7230
Telephone: (949) 253-4905